

**REMARKS**

With this amendment, Applicant adds claims 32-41 and cancels claim 3. Claims 1, 2 and 4-41 are all the claims pending in the application.

**1. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-22, 25, 26, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,534,888 to Lebby *et al.* (“Lebby”). For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites an image display apparatus that comprises an “image display mode setting device [that] includes a transparent input element provided on the respective image display screen of at least one image display medium of the plurality of image display mediums, and said image display mode setting device sets said image display mode under employment of the transparent input element.” (emphasis added.) The Examiner contends that page displays 116 of Lebby correspond to the claimed image display mediums and that col. 3, lines 10-30, of Lebby discloses the claimed transparent input element. Office Action at pages 2-3.

Lebby, at most, discloses that functions or controls 564 may be menu driven with a cursor or stylus on page display 116. (Col. 5, lines 65-67.) There is no disclosure or suggestion that a transparent input element is provided on the page display 116. Accordingly, at least the claimed transparent input element is not disclosed or suggested by Lebby.

The Examiner’s reliance on Col. 3, lines 10-30, is misplaced since this section merely describes the construction of the page display 116 itself. There is no disclosure or suggestion that a transparent input element is provided on the page display 116.

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Applicant submits that the Examiner's §102 rejection is improper.

Because method claim 10 recites features analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentable for at least reasons analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 6 recites an image display apparatus that comprises an "image display adjusting section [that] adjusts a display output of the display image according to ambient conditions at a location of the image display apparatus." The Examiner contends that col. 4, line 65, to col. 5, line 11, discloses this feature. Office Action at page 4.

Applicant submits that the Examiner's cited section merely discloses that graphical and textual materials may be displayed. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Lebby that the display image is adjusted for ambient conditions. Therefore, Applicant submits that Lebby does not disclose or suggest the claimed image display adjusting section as set forth in claim 6.

Claim 8 recites an image display apparatus that comprises "a lens sheet provided on the image display screen of an image display medium of the plurality of image display mediums." The Examiner contends that col. 3, lines 10-30, discloses the claimed feature.

Applicant submits that the cited section merely discloses the construction of page display 116. There is no disclosure or suggestion that a lens sheet is provided on the page display 116. Therefore, Lebby does not disclose or suggest the claimed lens sheet as set forth in claim 8.

Claim 15 recites an image display apparatus that comprises "a plurality of ... image display mediums .... wherein each of two surface sides of each image display medium of the

plurality of image display mediums displays has an image display screen for displaying an image, wherein a first surface side of said two surface sides has a first image display screen for displaying a first image, and wherein a second surface side of said two surface sides has a second image display screen for displaying a second image.” (emphasis added.) The Examiner contends that col. 4, lines 27-40, of Lebby discloses the claimed image display medium. Office Action at page 5.

The Examiner’s cited section merely discloses that the plurality of page displays 116, 316 display graphical and textual material.” At most, this section may indicate that one side of the page displays 116, 316 may have a display screen. There is no disclosure or suggestion that each of the two surface sides of each page display has an image display screen. Therefore, Applicant submits that Lebby does not disclose or suggest the claimed image display mediums as set forth in claim 15.

Applicant submits that claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11-14, 16-22, 25, 26, 29 and 30 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

In addition, claim 25 recites an image display apparatus that comprises a “plurality of electronic papers [that] are sequentially connected in an accordion-folded form, an edge of each electronic paper being connected with an edge of a next electronic paper.” (emphasis added.) The Examiner contends that Fig. 1 of Lebby discloses the claimed features. Office Action at page 6.

Applicant submits that Fig. 1 does not disclose or suggest that page displays 116 are sequentially connected. A fair reading of Lebby would suggest, at most, that the page displays

116 are connected in parallel to electronics 130. Therefore, Lebby does not suggest or disclose at least the claimed sequential connection of the electronic papers as set forth in claim 25.

Because method claim 30 recites features analogous to those recited in claim 25, Applicant submits that claim 30 is additionally patentable for at least reasons analogous to those given above with respect to claim 25.

**2. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 23, 24, 27, 28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lebby in view of US Patent No. 6,222,513 to Howard *et al.* ("Howard"). For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

Because Howard does not cure the deficient teachings of Lebby given above with respect to claims 1 and 10, Applicant submits that claims 23, 27, 28 and 31 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

Claim 24 recites features analogous to those given above with respect to claim 25. Because Howard does not cure the deficient teachings given above with respect to claim 25, Applicant submits that claim 24 is patentable at least for reasons analogous to those given above with respect to the subject matter of claim 25.

**3. New Claims**

With this amendment, Applicant adds claims 32-41. Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies, as well as the features set forth therein.

**4. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Bhaskar Kakarla  
Registration No. 54,627

Date: March 14, 2006